

HINT A MILLION IN GRAFT HELD UP CHEAPER LIGHT

Thompson Committee Tries to
Learn What Choked Off
Longacre Co.

EDISON CO. FOUGHT IT.
Interborough Could Sell Excess
Power for \$5,000,000, Half
to Go to City.

The Thompson Committee put on record to-day the fact that the Longacre Power Company tried four years ago to sell electric current cheap in New York City but was choked off by the New York Edison Company. There had been negotiations with the Interborough Rapid Transit Company for taking its surplus electricity manufactured in the slack hours. The plan would have yielded a profit of \$5,000,000 or \$5,000,000 a year, of which the City of New York, as the Interborough's partner, would receive \$2,500,000.

Counsel Frank Moss tried to bring out a statement that "some one in one of the companies" had demanded a "commission" of \$1,000,000, and failing to get it had blocked the plan; but neither Samuel Undermyer nor De Lancey Nicolli nor Frank Hedley could remember anything about that.

T. H. Gillespie, who was in attendance with his counsel, Paul D. Cravath, was instructed to appear before the Committee Thursday morning. His father, T. A. Gillespie, head of the T. A. Gillespie Company, is also summoned for Thursday. He will be asked about "commitments and obligations."

Samuel Undermyer was the first witness called to-day before the Thompson Investigating Committee. His firm, he said, was retained a few years ago by the Longacre Light and Power Company. He remembered that Joseph H. Hoadly and a Mr. Hoadly were active in it.

EDISON COMPANY FOUGHT THE NEW CONCERN IN COURTS.
The company was organized years ago to supply electric current in the City of New York," said Mr. Undermyer. "I think it had a small power house. The New York Edison Company fought it bitterly claiming that as charter had lapsed. The actions were fought up to the Court of Appeals several times. The Edison Company came out in the open only in the latter part of the fight."

The company could not at first get permission to open the streets; then it had to fight to get permission to lay its pipes."

Q. Did the Manhattan Transit Company control the Longacre Power Company? A. Yes. It did then and for all I know it does still.

Q. Did Mr. Croker and Mr. Freedman own the Manhattan Transit Company? A. No.

Q. Was not the Longacre Company associated with the Interborough Company? A. I don't know. If it was the connection was through Mr. Shonta.

Q. Did not the Longacre Company apply to the Public Service Commission for permission to issue \$2,000,000 stock and \$5,000,000 bonds, and did not the Edison Company oppose it? A. I remember it vaguely now. It was years ago. At that time John C. Sheehan was the principal owner in the Longacre Company, and he

fought the opposition through his counsel.

Mr. Undermyer continued: "I think the lighting situation in the city of New York is a pretty sad state. The Edison Company controls the ducts. That ought to belong to the city of New York. Any company should be at liberty to supply and sell electricity in this city. Any company that tries now to sell electricity here has to fight the Edison Company, which is a subsidiary of the Edison Company and controls all the ducts."

Q. Did the plan of the Longacre Co. contemplate taking power from the surplus of other companies, accumulating that power and sell it? A. That was the plan they were trying to develop.

Q. Did they try to buy surplus power from the Interborough Co.? A. I think they did. I remember that there were some conferences about it. Q. Mr. Hedley testified to two conferences he had with Mr. and Mrs. Freedman? A. I don't remember them. I don't know Mr. Hedley, though I know who he is. I know there were negotiations, but they fell through.

Q. Why did those negotiations come to naught? A. It would be pretty difficult for me to say why. They would certainly have proved profitable. I think it would make a long story.

De Lancey Nicolli was called to the witness stand and questioned on the same subject. He declared that what he learned on the subject came to him as counsel to the Interborough Company, which it would be against the statute for him to reveal.

"There is another point which I ought to mention in frankness," said the witness. "I think the power of this committee terminated with the adjournment of the Legislature. The committee's function is over. You have other witnesses to go."

"I object to Mr. Nicolli giving points to other witnesses," said Mr. Moss. "We don't need instruction as to the law," exclaimed Mr. Moss.

NEVER HEARD OF DEMAND FOR LARGE SUM OF MONEY.

"I think the only thing the Interborough put up to me was as to the validity and power of the Longacre Company," said Mr. Nicolli when he and Mr. Moss had cooled down a little.

Q. Did you know that for the Interborough Company to sell surplus power to the Longacre Company would have resulted in making millions? A. I don't know anything about the financial part of it, said Mr. Nicolli.

Q. Did you ever hear that some body connected with one of these companies demanded a large sum of money, because they were given to him the negotiations fell through?

"Please define your question," said Mr. Nicolli, wrinkling his forehead.

"I don't know anything about the financial part of it," said Mr. Nicolli.

Q. How much surplus power are you making now? A. We could make about \$50,000,000 kilowatt hours per annum over and above what we are doing now.

This would make a profit of \$5,000,000 a year.

Q. You previously testified that by selling your surplus power you could get a profit of \$2,500,000 or \$5,000,000 a year. A. I think so still. If the Interborough Company can in legal form sell its surplus power without increasing the price, it would be a good business to do it. We could make a good profit out of it, and under the dual contract the city of New York, as the company's partner, would make half the profit.

Mr. Hedley recalled a brief conference with Samuel Undermyer on the subject of selling the surplus power to the Longacre Company. He asked 11-2 cents per kilowatt hour, and afterward came to 1-10 cents.

Q. What made the deal fall by the wayside? A. I don't know.

James I. Quackenbush, counsel to the Interborough Company, intervened to say that while the court had allowed the company to sell electric current to another railroad for transportation purposes, he doubted whether they would let the surplus go into a general business of selling electric power.

MOTHER AND DAUGHTER HELD FOR EXTORTION

Lawyer Charges Them and Two Friends With Getting \$200 From Him.

Mrs. Ernestine Shaffer, her daughter, Gladys, eighteen, and Mr. and Mrs. William Ahrendorf, all living at No. 280 McDougal Street, Brooklyn, were arraigned before Magistrate Steers in the Gates Avenue Police Court to-day charged with having extorted \$200 from Attorney Frank Cuccia, who is a law partner of Deputy Attorney General Charles Masone, said the four prisoners figured as witnesses in a divorce case he was handling, called at his office frequently and finally accused him of having taken advantage of her. According to Cuccia, she and her mother then demanded \$200.

The lawyer told Mrs. Shaffer, Gladys and the Ahrendorfs to call on him last evening. In a room adjoining his office were Sergeants Scoville and Higley of the Borough Headquarters squad. Cuccia handed the Shaffers \$200 and then shattered a glass paper weight, a prearranged signal, which brought the police into the room. Magistrate Steers held the prisoners in jail of \$1,000 each for an examination Thursday.

Woman Suffrage Means Better Babies, Says Doctor Who Denies That New York Mothers Neglect Kiddies to Play Cards

Charge That Nineteen Out of Twenty Wives in This City Refuse to Nurse Their Infants Is Refuted by Dr. Mary Halton.

Better Fathers in Second Year Are as Necessary as Better Mothers in First Year to Make Babies Better, She Asserts.

By Nicola Greeley-Smith.

Dr. Abraham Jacoby opened the Mayor's Baby Week by telling a meeting at the Casino Theatre that the trouble with the babies in New York City is that so many women are busy keeping engagements to play cards that they have no time to nurse their babies and that the health of the babies depends on getting the mothers' milk.

"Nineteen out of twenty women can nurse their babies and should be made to do it," Dr. Jacoby said.

"Nineteen out of twenty mothers in New York City nurse their babies and they do nurse their babies," Dr. Mary Halton remarked when I sought her in her office at No. 616 Madison Avenue to ask her what she thought of the charge the Nestor of American Medicine had brought against the women of New York.

"I have been in charge of a baby's clinic for the Board of Health for five or six years," Dr. Halton told me. "Before that I helped Miss Lillian Wald with the babies of the Henry Street Settlement. I have studied babies in Hell's Kitchen and in Harlem. So, perhaps, it will be admitted that when I talk baby I am not talking baby talk."

"All the mothers who come to my clinic nurse their babies. The women who are wives of workmen and clerks do not shirk their duty. They are proud to do it. Their mother love and their eagerness to learn how to care for their babies is touching and beautiful. Dr. Jacoby must refer to women of the leisure class—less than 15 per cent. of the whole—when he talks about card playing. But it is the women with whom I come in contact who are the mothers of the race. An anti-suffrage orator said not long ago that 92 per cent. of American women do their own housework. That would leave 8 per cent. who have leisure to go to card parties and who, according to Dr. Jacoby, neglect their babies for the card table. There is some truth in his statement, perhaps. But, let me say this: A good cow is better than a nervous mother. But a nervous, hysterical, driven creature is invariably a bad cow. Haven't you noticed how furious a farmer gets if a bad boy chases his cow? That's because if the cow gets nervous it affects her milk. Now, a driven mother is as bad as a driven cow. A woman rushing from one thing to another all day is just as much affected as the cow that has been chased by a bad boy. So, perhaps, it is a good thing that Dr. Jacoby's card-playing mothers don't nurse their babies themselves. I know one nervous woman whose baby is being fed on what the Board of Health would classify as first grade milk simply because she insists on nursing it herself. As a general thing, though, the mother baby has a much better start than the cow baby."

"Better fathers are as necessary as better mothers," Dr. Halton continued earnestly. "The mother nurses the baby the first year of his life, but father feeds it the second year. That is, father supplies milk from the can. If fathers spent less money on drink and didn't loaf on their jobs so much mothers would be in a position to give their second-year babies more nourishing food."

"Then your programme for better babies is, more care from mother the first year and more care from father the second year," I summarized.

Dr. Halton nodded emphatically. "And you may say that I had a 100 per cent. baby from my clinic in the 'Better Babies' Contest," she continued—"a bottle baby, too."

"There's one other recommendation for better babies—that is better babies," the woman physician said. "The lowest death rate in the world for babies is in New Zealand, where women have had the vote for twenty years. The death rate in New Zealand is 51 per 1,000; in the United States it is 124."

"New Zealand, Norway and Australia, the first three countries with the lowest death rates, are all Woman Suffrage countries. In all of the seven which have a lower death rate than the United States women have at least the municipal vote. In Italy, Spain, Germany and Russia where the death rate is highest, women have never had the vote for twenty years. The death rate in New Zealand is 51 per 1,000; in the United States it is 124."

"In the United States we spend \$165,000 a year to protect babies and \$165,000 a year to protect hogs. When of all the civilized world, the country that has had the Woman Suffrage the longest has the lowest death rate, and the five countries with the next lowest rate all have Woman Suffrage, can there be a doubt that Woman Suffrage is a factor in better babies and healthier living conditions for all the people?"

"Isn't it evident that when mothers are represented in Government and their opinions and interests are consulted, babies have a better chance? Isn't it proved that women with the ballot do not neglect their home and babies?"

"Giving the ballot to women not only helps them to do their own work more efficiently, but actually increases the health of the nation."

So say better votes for better babies.

LAKE STEAMER SINKS; 20 MEN BELIEVED LOST

Only Two Aboard the S. R. Kirby Known Saved When Vessel Breaks and Goes Down.

SAULT STE MARIE, Mich., May 9.—Twenty persons are believed to have been drowned when the steamer S. R. Kirby of the Northwestern Transportation Company of Detroit and Cleveland, broke in two during a storm on Lake Superior yesterday and sank. The disaster occurred four miles off Eagle River, Mich.

Otto Lindquist, a stoker on the Kirby, was picked from floating wreckage yesterday afternoon by sailors on the steamer Joseph Block. When brought here to-day Lindquist declared he saw the Kirby sink and that, so far as he knew, he was the only survivor. The Kirby was commanded by Capt. David Girardin Jr. of Detroit, who sank to his death within one hundred feet of Lindquist.

Those believed drowned were: Capt. Girardin, Mate E. M. Douglas, John Weston, Robert Powers, Louis Flodine, Loyal Blaisdell, Ansel Peterson, Elmer Rydolph, Robert Thirt, William Winger, Frank Casey, Sylvester Smith, Ralph B. Smith, Anthony Ward, Henry Holman, Burt Heath, Ralph Heath, Herman Zuger, Harry Martin, Alf Anderson.

44,000 PRISONERS DIED ON SERBIAN RETREAT

Captors Themselves Were Starving, Robert Maverick, American Secretary of Legation, Says.

Robert Maverick of Texas, secretary of the American Legation to Serbia, arrived here to-day on the Touraine of the French Line. He left his chief, Charge d'Affaires George Lorillard of New York, at Corfu. Mr. Maverick said it was several months after they were sent to Serbia from the embassy at Paris before they could catch up with the retreating Serbian Government and present credentials.

About the only work at hand was that of spending 50,000 kronen provided by the Austrian Government for the relief of Austrian prisoners of the Serbian Army. The Serbians themselves were starving and in rags, and there was little money could buy for their captives, whose number was reduced by sickness and privations from 50,000 to 6,000 in the retreat.

TURKS PLANNING STAND AGAINST SLAV ADVANCE

Decisive Action Is Expected to Begin Shortly in Asia Minor.

PETROGRAD, May 9.—The latest official bulletin from the Turkish front indicates that the Russian advance on the centre, toward Erzurum and Sivas, which has been delayed by melting snow, has been resumed.

The general opinion in military circles here is that the Turks are now ready to make a determined stand against the further advance of the Grand Duke's armies, and that the campaign in Asia Minor has reached a most important, possibly a decisive, stage.

Military opinion here, however, does not underestimate the strength of the Turkish opposition. It is generally considered that the main Turkish army, despite its defeats, is still virtually intact, having retired without fighting rather than risk being cut off and overwhelmed in the Armenian mountain country.

Wilson Unopposed in Alabama.

MONTGOMERY, Ala., May 9.—Alabama Democrats, in a State-wide presidential preference primary, to-day voted for delegates to the National Convention, ten candidates for representative in Congress, a national committee and candidates for State and county officers. President Wilson is unopposed for the presidential nomination.

EXHUME BODIES OF TWO MORE IN HUNT FOR POISON

New Haven Authorities Take Hand in Case of Accused Woman Keeper of Home.

NEW HAVEN, Conn., May 9.—Authorities investigating the case of Mrs. Amy E. Archer-Gilligan, proprietor of the Archer Home for Elderly People at Windsor, now under arrest on a charge of poisoning, to-day announced the discovery of ten bodies of late inmates of the home buried in New Haven County. Two of these have been exhumed for examination.

The authorities here declined to say whether the remaining eight would be exhumed. They said this would be up to the authorities of Hartford County, where Mrs. Archer-Gilligan is being held. The burial places of all persons who died at the home during the past five years will be determined and should the disclosures on the already exhumed bodies warrant it, all of it is believed, will be examined.

Mrs. Archer-Gilligan was arrested on the poisoning charge after the examination of the body of Franklin H. Andrews, who died at the home, disclosed that a liberal dose of arsenic caused the man's death. Andrews died May 30, 1914. His body was exhumed a week ago. The number of deaths in the home in the past five years was more than two score.

Mrs. Archer-Gilligan is being held for the Grand Jury without bond. In the Hartford County Jail to-day Mrs. Gilligan denied any connection with the death of Andrews. "I will prove my innocence if it takes my last cent," she said.

Mrs. Archer-Gilligan has a daughter, Mary, eighteen years old, who is an assistant at the home. A niece and a servant are the only others employed in the establishment.

TIRPITZISM SCORED BY BERLIN NEWSPAPER

Lokal Anzeiger Declares the Original U-Boat Order Was a Great Mistake.

BERLIN, via London, May 9.—A striking article on German-American relations, which is construed here as a criticism of Admiral von Tirpitz, appeared in yesterday's issue of the Lokal Anzeiger. After expressing approval of the German Government's reply to the American note, the article says:

"The decision would have been easier if public opinion had not been influenced and inflamed in other directions by certain irresponsible persons. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of 1915 with great weapons and pretexts for the United States that the submarine was a new weapon which it could not obtain. It was wrong to preach that the submarine was a new weapon. It is just the same proposition as was the great mistake made in announcing at the beginning of